

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

**DOUGLAS D. RAGSDALE,
Plaintiff,**

v.

CASE NO.: 3:19-cv-00254-MPM-JMV

**MISSISSIPPI STATE, ET AL.,
Defendants.**

ORDER

On June 8, 2020, *pro se* Plaintiff Douglas Ragsdale filed two documents, “Memorandum to Motion to Lift Stay” [24] and “Memorandum Motion to Lift Stay” [25]. In these documents, Mr. Ragsdale essentially reasserts and expounds claims asserted in the complaint and requests that the Court “lift/remove ‘Stay’ and continue with [c]ivil [s]uit.” On February 27, 2020, the undersigned entered a stay Order [12] that provided the following:

This matter is before the Court on the Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, filed by Defendants State of Mississippi and Mickey Mallette [10]. Therein, these defendants assert their Eleventh Amendment immunity from suit, and Assistant District Attorney Mallette asserts his prosecutorial immunity. Rule 16(b)(3)(B) of the Local Uniform Civil Rules of the United States District Courts for the Northern District of Mississippi and the Southern District of Mississippi states that filing an immunity or jurisdictional defense motion “stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.”

Because an immunity defense motion is still pending before the district judge and because Mr. Ragsdale has presented no persuasive argument or authority in support of lifting the current stay, the instant request is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 15th day of July, 2020.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE